

MT. SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Addendum No. 1

June 16, 2016

Consultant for the Development of a District Educational Master Plan (EMP) RFP No. 3026

To All Bidders:

All bidders shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum via email to Teresa Patterson at the following email address: tpatterson@mtsac.edu.

Changes/Clarifications:

Item No. 1: Article 1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION:

Add: On February 17, 2016, The Board of Trustees approved the proposed revisions to the College Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Core Values. Please refer to the following link:

<http://www.mtsac.edu/about/overview/mission-and-goals.html>

Item No. 2: Article 1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION:

Add: The definition for "program review" as stated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC) is: "The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans." The minimum ACCJC requirements are that Career Technical Education (CTE) programs are evaluated every two years and all other programs are evaluated every four years.

Mt. SAC follows the ACCJC format; however, Mt. SAC engages in an annual program review as part of our Planning for Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) process. This process is designed to create a closer connection among planning, outcomes assessment, and resource requests. The most recent documents for the 2014-2015 cycle are available here:

<http://www.mtsac.edu/governance/committees/iec/2014-15completedPIE.html>

Item No. 3: Article 2. PROPOSED PROJECT – Educational Master Plan, Planning Team and Process:

Delete: “Each candidate should be prepared to illustrate examples of data they collect and how they use this data appropriately to direct the future growth of a District.”

Item No. 4 Article 2. PROPOSED PROJECT – Educational Master Plan, Planning Team and Process:

Change from: “It is assumed that the consulting team will meet with each District academic department (over 40) and programs and units (including each unit within Office of Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, Human Resources, and the Office of the President per attached list) a minimum of three times to develop, review and finalize their area-specific summary narratives.”

Change to: “It is assumed that the consulting team will meet with each District academic *discipline, program, and unit* (including each unit within Office of Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, Human Resources, and the Office of the President) a minimum of three times to develop, review and finalize their area-specific summary narratives.

Item No. 5: Article 3. SCOPE OF REQUIRED SERVICES, Final Product, Item E.6 Perceptions about the District:

Add:

a. Summary of On-campus Interviews

b. Summary of Community Advisory Committee Interviews

Item No. 6: Not Used

Item No. 7: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA, Proposal Format:

Change from: “Copies are to be printed back-to-back and bound with a single staple in the upper left corner.”

Change to: “Copies are to be printed back-to-back and bound *in any format deemed appropriate.*”

Item No. 8: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA, Content and Order of RFP Response:

Change table from:

Section	<u>Section Title</u>	<u>Page Limit</u>	<u>Points</u>
A	Letter of Interest and Approach	7	5
B	Consultant's Personnel and Staffing Resources	6	20
C	Related Experience and Methodology	5	20
D	Fee Schedule	2	40
E	Litigation History	1	5
F	References	4	10
	Total	25	100

Change table to:

Section	<u>Section Title</u>	<u>Page Limit</u>	<u>Points</u>
A	Letter of Interest and Approach	7	15
B	Consultant's Personnel and Staffing Resources	7	20
C	Related Experience and Methodology	5	20
D	<i>Deliverables</i>	6	30
E	Litigation History	1	5
F	References	4	10
	Total	30	100

Item No. 9: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA, Content and Order of RFP Response:

Add: *Total proposal page limit is exclusive of cover page, table of contents, tabs, appendix items, and complete examples of previous master plans.*

Item No. 10: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA, Content and Order of RFP Response, Section A: Letter of Interest and Approach, subsection a.

Change from: "Each candidate should be prepared to illustrate examples of data they collect and how they use this data appropriately to direct the future growth of a District."

Change to: "***At the interview***, each candidate should be prepared to illustrate examples of data they collect and how they use this data appropriately to direct the future growth of a District. ***The proposal approach should be limited to addressing the type of data to be collected and how it is used.***"

- Item No. 11: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA, Content and Order of RFP Response, Section C: Related Experience and Methodology:
- Change from:** “Submit complete examples of similar Educational Master Plans.”
- Change to:** “Submit *a minimum of one and a maximum of three* complete examples of similar Educational Master Plans *in digital format on a CD or flash drive.*”
- Item No. 12: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA, Content and Order of RFP Response, Section D: Fee Schedule:
- Delete** section in its entirety.
- Replace with:**
- Section D: Deliverables** – *Clearly identify the scope of basic services and specify any work that would be considered additional services. It is the proposer’s responsibility to understand the complexity of the District as well as the complexity of the proposed work. Refer to Article 3. SCOPE OF REQUIRED SERVICES. If selected (short-listed) for an interview, Proposer shall agree to provide a complete fee breakdown at the time of interview.*
- Item No. 13: Article 5. SUBMITTAL FORMAT AND SELECTION CRITERIA:
- Add:**
- Section G: Appendixes** – *The following forms shall be submitted in an Appendix to the proposal response.*
- ***Statement of Compliance***
 - ***Non-Collusion Declaration***
 - ***Contractor’s Certification Regarding Workers’ Compensation***
 - ***Insurance Certificate***

Item No. 14: Article 6. SELECTION PROCESS:

Add:

If selected for an interview, Proposer shall submit a proposed fee schedule including a detailed breakdown of the fee by deliverable and fully burdened hourly rates for each title/individual proposed for the work. Clearly identify the scope of basic services and specify any work that would be considered additional services. It is the proposer's responsibility to understand the complexity of the District as well as the complexity of the proposed work and to submit a not-to-exceed fee accordingly.

- a. The fee for services shall be submitted using the format described in Attachment A – Fee Proposal. It shall be signed by the Principal-in-Charge and the Principal Planner designated for this project.***
- b. The Fee Proposal shall include all costs to complete the scope of work including working with the FMP consultant to develop and finalize the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP).***
- c. Provide a list of hourly rates for anticipated positions within the Proposer's organizational structure with the fee proposal. Additional services shall be billed to the District at the Proposer's contracted hourly rates. Such rates shall include all labor, materials, overhead and profit (OH&P), and other direct and indirect costs including incidental travel.***
- d. Provide a signed statement by the Principal-in-Charge that the proposal is valid for 180 days from the time of submission.***
- e. Provide a signed statement that the named people will actually perform the work when the planning effort begins.***

Item No. 15: Article 7. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS: ALL RESPONSES MUST BE RECEIVED BY NO LATER THAN:

Change from: "Friday, June 23, 2016, 2:00 PM."

Change to: "**Thursday**, June 23, 2016, 2:00 PM."

Item No. 16: REFERENCES form:

Change from: “The District is particularly interested in evaluating references of 2-year California public community colleges similar in size and budget to Mt. SAC.”

Change to: “The District is particularly interested in evaluating references of 2-year California public community colleges similar in size ~~and budget~~ to Mt. SAC.”

Response to Requests for Information:

Question No 1: Do you have an approximate budget for the EMP?

Response: No, a specific EMP budget has not been developed. However, the District has set aside adequate funds to fully fund this effort.

Question No 2: Do you anticipate the need to review and update the recently adopted Vision, Mission, and Values statements?

Response: No, not unless it is required after the District undergoes a comprehensive review from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College (ACCJC) in March 2017.

Refer to Addendum Item No. 1. However, we expect that the Mission, Vision, and Core Values will be reflected in the final Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) document.

Question No 3: In Section F "References," you ask for all 4-year and 2-year university and college districts for whom we have worked. The page limit is 4. You also include a reference sheet with 6 slots and the language "List additional references...." Because there will be overlap, do you want two separate submission sheets/forms?

Response: Yes, please provide two separate submissions - one listing all four-year higher education and two-year community college clients that you have contracted with in the last five (5) years and one using the Reference form provided that lists references of two-year California public community colleges in similar size to Mt. SAC per Addendum Item No. 16.

Question No 4: Does the college have a current subscription to EMSI?

Response: Yes.

Question No 5: Do you have current program review or other such documents at the department levels that include program plans?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item No. 2. Additionally, program-specific advisory committee minutes for Career Technical Education programs (CTE) are available.

Question No 6: What is the status of program review?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item No. 2 — the Planning for Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) process is annual. Additionally, the Education Design Committee (EDC) meets regularly and evaluates curriculum on an ongoing basis and reports to the Curriculum and Instruction Council.

Question No 7: How would you like the new EMP to be different from the last?

Response: Differences include, but are not limited to, a more comprehensive review of academic programs and institutional support functions. The proposed list of deliverables should thoroughly address all aspects of the RFP as well as incorporate the experience of the Proposer. The professional opinion of the Proposer, in terms of the extent and depth of the effort, will be a critical part of the evaluation.

Question No 8: Section F: “Fee Schedule” has a two page limit. Does that include Attachment A “Project Fees”?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item Nos. 8, 12, and 14.

Question No 9: What format(s) will be acceptable for submitting examples of EMPs?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item No. 11.

Question No 10: CD with Educational Master Plans prepared in the past is sufficient to provide examples of work for our firm?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item No. 11.

Question No 11: How will District plan to evaluate the overall proposal if fee is provided in a confidential envelope?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item Nos. 8, 12, and 14.

Question No 12: Under Scope of Required Services #6 Perceptions about the District. Does District expect consultant to provide general survey about the District from students, faculty and staff? Or want specific study about the District perceptions from Students, businesses and residents at large? Should this cost be listed separately so District can choose this as an option?

Response: Refer to Addendum Item No. 5. The fee proposal shall reflect the cost to both conduct and prepare the interview summaries. Neither a general survey nor specific studies are required.

END OF ADDENDUM